



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/692,322	10/23/2003	Leonardo E. Blanco	MS1-1716US	8609
22801	7590	12/28/2006	EXAMINER	
LEE & HAYES PLLC 421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500 SPOKANE, WA 99201			CARLETON, THUY T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2196	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		12/28/2006	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Notice of this Office communication was sent electronically on the above-indicated "Notification Date" and has a shortened statutory period for reply of 3 MONTHS from 12/28/2006.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

lhptoms@leehayes.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/692,322	Applicant(s) BLANCO ET AL.	
	Examiner Thuy Carleton	Art Unit 2196	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10/23/2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>03/08/2004</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-32 are pending and have been examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

3. Claims 1-5, 7-8 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Gershony et al. (US Patent 6,549,218), hereinafter "Gershony"

As claim 1, Gershony teaches a computer-executable method (col. 4, lines 19-21), comprising:

determining if a child window of a parent window is a legacy window (fig. 3, label 320 and 340; col. 7, lines 34-35 and lines 63-67; col. 8, lines 1-4)

if so, causing the child window output to be redirected to an off-screen buffer (fig. 2, label 250; col. 2, lines 51-55; col. 3, lines 8-12; col. 6, lines 18-21 and 66-67; col. 7, lines 1-2);

retrieving the child window output from the off-screen buffer (col. 3, lines 8-12);

applying a visual enhancement to the child window output (col. 3, lines 5-16);

and composing a visual representation of the parent window with the visually enhanced child window output (col. 3, lines 5-16).

As claim 2, Gershony further teaches the legacy window is configured to be administered by a legacy display component having fewer visual enhancements than a Media Integration Layer (MIL) component (fig. 4; col. 8, lines 43-46, providing special effects to show that MIL has more enhanced functions than the legacy component).

As claim 3, Gershony further teaches causing the child window output to be redirected comprises instructing the legacy display component to redirect the child window output to the off-screen buffer (col.3, lines 5-16).

As claim 4, Gershony further teaches the legacy display component comprises a user subcomponent (fig. 2, label 220) and a Graphics Device Interface subcomponent (fig. 2, label 230; col. 6, lines 18-26).

As claim 5, Gershony further teaches the visual enhancement comprises a selected one or more from a group comprising re-sizing, re-shaping, relocating window component output, applying transparency, rotating and translating window component output (col. 3, lines 17-27), and applying a texture or visual effect to the window component output (col. 3, lines 5-16).

As claim 7, Gershony further teaches the visual representation of the parent window is performed by the MIL component (col. 3, lines 8-12).

As claim 8, Gershony further teaches a computer-readable medium (fig. 1, label 32) having computer-executable instructions (fig. 1, label 36; col. 5, lines 3-7) for performing the method recited in claim 1.

Art Unit: 2196

As claim 17, Gershony teaches a computer-executable medium (col. 4, lines 65-67; col. 5, lines 1-2) having computer executable components medium (col. 4, lines 65-67; col. 5, lines 1-2) comprising

a user component configured to create an off-screen buffer (fig. 2, label 250; col. 2, lines 51-55; col. 3, lines 8-12); col. 6, lines 66-67; col. 7, lines 1-2) upon detecting the presence of a legacy child window of a parent window (fig. 3, label 320 and 340; col. 7, lines 34-35 and lines 63-67; col. 8, lines 1-4);

a GDI component configured to redirect window output from the legacy child window (fig. 3, label 230; col. 6, lines 25-26) upon being notified by the user component of the existence of the legacy child window (fig. 2, label 220; col. 2, lines 19-25; col. 6, lines 18-21);

and a MIL component configured (col. 3, lines 5-8) to apply a visual enhancement to the redirected window output in connection with composing the parent window for display on a display device (col. 3, lines 5-16).

4. Claims 9-13, 16 and 22-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lupu (US Pub 2004/0100480).

As claim 9, Lupu teaches a computer-executable method (fig. 1, label 35, 36 and 38; par [0023], lines 1-4), comprising:

receiving a notification that an input event occurred (fig. 5, label 112; par [0034], lines 5-8), the input event including a location on a screen display (fig. 5, label 116; par [0034], lines 14-17), the location being within a boundary of a parent window (fig. 5, label 116; par [0034], lines 14-17) , the parent window being compatible with a MIL component (fig. 5, label 118; par [0034], lines

Art Unit: 2196

17-19, it is compatible with the window manager and current operation, which will require no further action for the events);

determining where on the parent window the input event occurred (fig. 5, label 116, par [0034], lines 9-11) by:

evaluating the notification to identify which of a plurality of windows corresponds to the location (par [0030], lines 9-12);

if the location is within a boundary of a non-legacy child window (par [0034], lines 17-19),

evaluating where on the non-legacy child window the input event occurred (par [0034], lines 14-16);

if the location is within a boundary of a legacy child window (par [0034], lines 19-22), the child window being a legacy window that does not have native capability to interact with the MIL component, referring the notification to a legacy display component (fig. 5, label 116 and 118; par [0034], line 17-19), and notifying an appropriate child window of the input event (par [0034], lines 9-11), the appropriate child window corresponding to the location (fig. 5, label 120 and 122; par [0034], lines 19-28). It is inherent that receiving notifications of an input event on a display screen or inside the boundary of a window, whether parent, child or legacy the same logic can be applied to all to determine and evaluate where on the window the event occurred and relaying the notification to the appropriate window or component, via the window manager.

As claim 10, Lupu further teaches receiving a notification that the input event occurred within a boundary of a second child window (fig. 5, label 112; par [0034], lines 5-8), the second child window being a child of the first child window, and repeating the determination step for the first child window (par [0034], lines 17-19). It is inherent that every time there is an input to any window (parent, child or legacy) the same logic can be applied for receiving a notification of an

Art Unit: 2196

input event for the first child window.

As claim 11, Lupu further teaches evaluating notifications evaluating data structures associated with the MIL component that describe relationships between the parent window and a plurality of child windows on the parent window (par [0021], lines 14-17; par [0030], lines 9-12, that programs modules (e.g., MIL) evaluate notifications and compare them against data structures to associate them between a group of windows).

As claim 12, Lupu further teaches the data structures do not include information about other windows that are legacy children of legacy child windows on the parent window (par [0021], lines 14-17; par [0030], lines 9-12, that programs modules (e.g., MIL) contains data structures that reference pertinent configuration information of windows (parent, child or legacy)).

As claim 13, Lupu further teaches the data structures include information about other windows that are non-legacy children of legacy child windows on the parent window (par [0021], lines 14-17; par [0030], lines 9-12, that programs modules (e.g., MIL) contain data structures that have references to windows associated with applications, programs and other information for the proper functionality and relationship between windows).

As claim 16, Lupu further teaches computer-readable medium (fig. 1, label 27, 28, 29, 31, 39; par [0022], lines 10-22) having computer-executable instructions (fig. 1, label 35, 36 and 38; par [0023], lines 1-4; claim 6) for performing the method recited in claim 9.

As claim 22, Lupu teaches a computer-readable medium (fig. 1, label 27, 28, 29, 31, 39; par [0022], lines 10-22) having computer executable instructions (fig. 1, label 35, 36 and 38; par [0023], lines 1-4; claim 6) comprising:
in a system having a display component for issuing instructions to notify a parent of the creation of a redirected child window, means for notifying the parent window that the redirected child window is being or has been set up window (fig. 2, label 72; fig. 5, label 116, 120 and 122; par [0027], lines 5-26; par [0034], lines 13-17).

As claim 23, Lupu further teaches the means for notifying the parent comprises a window message indicating that the redirected child window is being created (par [0027], lines 5-26).

As claim 24, Lupu further teaches the window message includes a window handle to the redirected child window (par [0027], lines 5-25).

As claim 25, Lupu further teaches the means for notifying the parent comprises a window message indicating that the redirected child window is about to be shown (par [0027], lines 63-67).

As claim 26, Lupu further teaches the window message includes a window handle to the redirected child window (par [0027], lines 5-25).

As claim 27, Lupu teaches a computer-readable medium (fig. 1, label 27, 28, 29, 31, 39; par [0022], lines 10-22) having computer executable instructions (fig. 1, label 35, 36 and 38;

Art Unit: 2196

par [0023], lines 1-4; claim 6) comprising:

in a system having a display component for issuing instructions to notify a parent window of the creation of a redirected child window, means for notifying the parent window of a change that affects the redirected child window (fig. 2, label 72; fig. 5, label 116, 120 and 122; par [0027], lines 5-26; par [0028], lines 24-27; par [0034], lines 13-17).

As claim 28, Lupu further teaches the means for notifying the parent comprises a window message indicating that the redirected child window has been updated (par [0018], lines 24-27).

As claim 29, Lupu further teaches the window message further comprises information that describes the change to the redirected child window (par [0018], lines 24-27).

As claim 30, Lupu further teaches the means for notifying the parent comprises a window message indicating that the redirected child window has experienced a change in z-order updated (par [0018], lines 24-27).

As claim 31, Lupu further teaches the window message further comprises a handle to a previous window in the z-order (par [0027], lines 3-5; par [0028], lines 8-27 that contain information including the current and past locations so the modules can make appropriate adjustments as needed or return the window to the last know configuration).

As claim 32, Lupu further teaches the means for notifying the parent comprises a window message indicating that the redirected child window has been destroyed (par [0027],

Art Unit: 2196

lines 5-26, showing the window is no longer available to be utilized by the current operation by sending a notification and removing the reference for the window).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gershony in view of Nason et al. (US Patent 6,717,596), hereinafter "Nason"

As claim 6, Gershony does not teach the visual enhancement comprises scaling the child window output to reflect a different screen resolution than originally applicable.

However, Nason teaches the visual enhancement comprises scaling the child window output to reflect a different screen resolution than originally applicable (fig. 9, label 146, 148, 152 and 154; col. 15, lines 26-40).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Gershony by scaling the child window output to reflect a different screen resolution than originally applicable as taught by Nason in order to repaint the image or window in a different resolution that was unavailable without the current/updated version to show an enhanced display of the object.

Art Unit: 2196

7. Claims 14 -15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lupu in view of Stall (US Patent 6,954,933).

As claim 14, Lupu does not teach the determining step is a cooperative process between the MIL component and the legacy display component.

However, Stall teaches the determining step is a cooperative process between the MIL component and the legacy display component (fig 5, col 6, lines 35-44).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the time the invention was made to modify Lupu by making the determining step a cooperative process between the MIL component and the legacy display component as taught by Stall in order to utilize communication protocol between modules and/or components that continuously update each other is essential in the operation of more than one module working together.

As claim 15, Lupu does not teach the legacy display component maintains information about the layout of legacy child windows, and wherein the MIL component maintains information about the layout of non-legacy child windows.

However, Stall teaches the legacy display component maintains information about the layout of legacy child windows, and wherein the MIL component maintains information about the layout of non-legacy child windows (fig 2, label 62, 64 and 66, col 5, lines 22-28).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the time the invention was made to modify Lupu by having the legacy display component maintain information about the layout of legacy child windows, and wherein the MIL component maintains information about the layout of non-legacy child windows as taught by Stall in order to use the information more

Art Unit: 2196

efficiently and act as an interface between two functions or to access storage that is organized according to data types.

8. Claims 18-19 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gershony in view of Stall.

As claim 18, Gershony does not teach the user component maintains data structures that describe a layout and position of the legacy child window and its legacy children. However, Stall teaches the user component maintains data structures that describe a layout and position of the legacy child window and its legacy children (fig 2, label 62, 64 and 66, col 5, lines 22-28).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art the time invention was made to modify Gershony by maintaining at the user component data structures that describe a layout and position of the legacy child window and its legacy children as taught by Stall in order to store data so it can be used more efficiently and act as an interface between two functions or to access storage that is organized according to data types.

As claim 19, Gershony does not teach the MIL component maintains data structures that describe a layout and position of the parent window and its children. However, Stall teaches the MIL component maintains data structures that describe a layout and position of the parent window and its children (fig 2, label 62, 64 and 66, col 5, lines 22-28). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art the time invention was made to modify Gershony by having the MIL component maintaining data structures that describe a layout and position of the parent window and its children as taught by Stall in order to

Art Unit: 2196

store data so it can be used more efficiently and act as an interface between two functions or to access storage that is organized according to data types.

As claim 21, Gershony does not teach the MIL component is further configured to interact with the user component and the GDI component to identify a location on a child window of the parent window corresponding to a location of an input event.

However, Stall teaches the MIL component is further configured to interact with the user component and the GDI component to identify a location on a child window of the parent window corresponding to a location of an input event (fig 5, col 6, lines 35-44).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art the time the invention was made to modify Gershony by having the MIL component configured to interact with the user component and the GDI component to identify a location on a child window of the parent window corresponding to a location of an input event as taught by Stall in order to ensure compatibility between the two modules and to provide the correct coordinates of the input event between windows.

9. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gershony in view of Stall and further in view of Nason.

As claim 20, Gershony further teaches the visual enhancement is at least one of a plurality of visual enhancements comprising re-sizing, re-shaping, relocating window component output, applying transparency, rotating and translating window component output (col. 3, lines 17-27), applying a texture or visual effect to the window component output (col. 3, lines 5-16).

Art Unit: 2196

Gershony and Stall do not teach scaling the legacy child window output to reflect a different screen resolution than originally applicable.

However, Nason teaches scaling the legacy child window output to reflect a different screen resolution than originally applicable (fig. 9, label 146, 148, 152 and 154; col. 15, lines 26-40).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art the time the invention was made to modify Gershony and Stall by scaling the legacy child window output to reflect a different screen resolution than originally applicable as taught by Nason in order to repaint the image or window in a different resolution that was unavailable without the current version to show an enhanced display of the object.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Broussard (US Patent 6,993,773) – System and method for introducing enhanced features into a java Swing application program interface.

Cull et al. (US Pub 2003/0214533) – system for providing a high-fidelity visual display coordinated with a full scope simulation of a complex system and method of using same for training and practice.

Lupu (US Patent 6,721,950) – Input redirection.

David et al. (US Patent 7,088,374) – System and method for managing visual structure, timing, and animation in a graphics processing system.

Rosenstein (US Patent) – Object-oriented window area display system.

Art Unit: 2196

Broussard (US Patent 6,918,093) – Inheritance of background color in a containment hierarchy of objects in a graphical user interface.

Stall (US Pub 2002/0075327) – Method and apparatus for high-performance rendering and hit-testing of a window tree.

Stall (US Patent 6,954,933) – Method and apparatus for providing and integrating high-performance message queues in a user interface environment.

Yennaco (US Patent 6,717,595) – Computer based list editor.

Mumford (US Patent 5,321,807) – Accelerated graphics display method.

Bahrs et al. (US Patent 6,901,554) – Method and apparatus in a data processing system for systematically separating application graphical user interface component placement from component sequencing and compound creation.

Capps (US Patent 5,634,100) – System and method for event parameter interdependence and adjustment with pen input.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thuy Carleton whose telephone number is 571-270-1258. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (7:00AM-5:00PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nabil El-Hady can be reached on 571-272-3963. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.


Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

Art Unit: 2196

system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

TC

Thuy Carleton


NABIL M. EL-HADY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER